

## REMARKS

A non-final Office Action, dated November 12, 2003, rejects pending claims 1-20. Claims 1, 5, and 16 have been amended herein. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

### Claim Objections

Applicants have amended claim 16 to correct the discrepancy noted by the examiner. Namely, the word "presences" has been changed to "presence."

### 35 USC § 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's rejection of claims 1-20 as being rendered obvious by the references of record. "Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so . . . ." [MPEP § 2143.01]. Applicants traverse the examiner's rejections of these claims on at least the following three grounds:

1. No teaching to electronically bundle a plurality of prescription orders from the same customer together.

As currently amended, all of the pending claims include limitations that the plurality of prescription orders for the same customer be electronically associated with each other. As explained more fully in the specification of the present application, this bundling allows facilitates tracking through the pharmacy and retrieval of all of the customer's filled prescription orders upon pickup.

None of the references of record teach or suggest such a feature. Accordingly, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious independent claims 1 and 5, as currently amended, and therefore they should now be in condition for allowance. Moreover, since dependant claims 2-4 and 6-20 depend on either claim 1 or 5, they too should now be in condition for allowance.

2. Detachable tracking tags

Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's comments that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a detachable tag with the invention of Denenberg et al, so that the tags may be

re-used." The examiner has cited no references to teach or suggest such a combination as claimed in claim 11. "The level of skill in the art cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references." (MPEP § 2143.01). Accordingly, applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's comments regarding this issue.

3. No teaching to combine references


Similarly, while McCullough discloses a customer notification display system, there is no teaching or suggestion in any references of record to use such a system in a pharmacy in accordance with the limitations of claims 2-4 and 16-19. Accordingly, these claims should also be allowable on these grounds.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that all of the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request that the case be passed to issuance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

April 12, 2004

By

  
John R. Dawson  
Registration No. 39,504

**ipsolon llp**  
805 SW Broadway # 2740  
Portland, Oregon 97205  
Phone No. (503) 419-0702  
Fax No. (503) 249-7068  
E-Mail: [john@ipsolon.com](mailto:john@ipsolon.com)